

REMARKS:

Claims 1-14 are in the case, but have been subjected to a restriction requirement.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant elects the prosecution of Species V (shown in Figs. 9 and 10), and further elects the SubSpecies D illustrated in Fig. 10.

Claims that may be generic to additional species beyond SubSpecies D are retained in case a broader claim is found allowable.

In any case, the applicant is believed entitled to examination of the following claims which are consistent with this election:

Claim 9 (which is a generic claim);


Claim 10 (which is directed to SubSpecies D as well as other embodiments of the invention, including an arcuate bracket slot);

Claims 12-14 (which are believed generic to all embodiments of the invention).

The remaining claims 1-8 and 11 are retained in case the subject matter is found allowable that may encompass these claims or, at least, to preserve applicant's rights to file a divisional application covering these claims at an appropriate time during the prosecution of this case.

Further favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter C. Michalos
Reg. No. 28,643
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: December 1, 2005

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706

Page 3 of 3